**Value Chains Working Group**

**What mechanisms can we use to reach the target of 40 – 60 000 beneficiaries?**

* not 40 – 60,000 new households. Leverage on existing list of beneficiaries (from INVC). The data that INVC has provided totals circa 39 000. This does not include the seed fair figures.
* The bridging activity does not add new beneficiaries.
* ACE Market Information System has the INVC beneficiaries listed (not all of them – only those which have a “full” profile)
* Do we have to go to 40,000? What is the number we can realistically reach? The figure of 40,000 comes from the productivity targets (which is 20,000 with an additional 1 or 2 people). This makes the 40,000 to 60,000 beneficiaries.
* Need to communicate the bridging activity at the district level
* Are we continuing to utilise the care group structure? It doesn’t appear in the CN
* Current partners for targeting – go through the existing structures. Divide the partners on the district?
* CADECOM is a national structure but it is set up slightly different according to the area.
* To what extent will the shifting of partners affect the targeting?
* In the past FUM was not in every EPA with INVC as INVC wanted to mitigate against double counting
* The EPAs were selected based on the areas with the highest productivity
* Choice: Ask the two partners to expand or you bring in a third partner
* FUM can expand – it has the capacity but the farmers “belong” to a partner so FUM cannot necessarily expand to cover the NASFAM partners (for example)
* NASFAM – will they continue to operate in the INVC areas without INVC funds? Yes.
* INVC chose to work through the care groups

Suggestion: In the areas where there is FUM / CADECOM we can carry on. In areas where there are NASFAM structures we have to come up with a plan on how we are going to work with the INVC beneficiaries if we aren’t working with NASFAM.

Approach NASFAM to ask them to give the details of their INVC beneficiaries to the bridging project… possible?

**Considering Project Activities; what role can each partner play based on their strengths**

* Timing – the idea is continuity and and transition – so there is no “gap”
* If there are partners that need to continue with certain activities then they need to be able to continue (for example seed procurement is a lengthy process and needs to be in place prior to October.
* Government structures – “we” should be complimenting their activities. Current partners are complimenting and working with govt extension. How clear is the role of the Govt extension services… do they have the resources? They have the mandate but how do they implement that mandate? One strategy to be implemented. Currently there are conflicts, DEC (multi-sectoral) and DAES – coordinating bodies for the sector.
* FUM has worked with DAES. The role of Govt is to set policy and to guide implementation.
* INVC approach to working with government structures (worked with DADOs). It reports to the district structure. The value chains work has been done through that. DADO sits on DEC.
* ACE – project activities (in the CN) look at approaching buyers directly, why not collaborate with ACE structures and relationships with buyers? ACE Can bring the strengths of collateral finance, market linkages and trade facilitation. The question is how ACE will work with the bridging project
* Access and availability of advance financing (bridge financing)
* Government intervention – maize flooding the market
* Collaborate seed fairs with the groups (CADECOM / FUM / ACE) certified seed.
* Seed fairs; – concrete projected demand needed. Seed companies need to be involved.

**What has INVC achieved:**

* Input suppliers – link farmers with STAM.
* Access to finance (given a revolving fund of 20 million)
* Not done well in processing (given processing equipment / threshers etc)
* Biggest challenge is collective marketing – they struggle to aggregate
* ACE has done well on SMS
* INVC has linked farmers to markets (marketing tours).
* ACE – facilitate direct trade and be more involved (lead) in the marketing tours
* The partners were like brokers…
* Major challenge of aggregation – is the capacity of the farmer association / cooperatives to buy.
* More trust in the cooperatives than the associations.
* INVC has promoted contract farming – with buyers such as sunseed and afri-nut.

There are elements that work, what will partners bring to the table?

* FUM: Build the structures (the cooperatives) that are there, organise the farmers, give them the capacity to cooperate with one another
* FUM & ACE: Communication elements need to be integrated. Use of SMS system
* ACE: access to collateral finance, access to storage, warehouse receipt system, facilitate trade (direct trade between sellers and buyers for soya and groundnuts, bids to buy / offers to sell, warehouse receipt sales
* MIST: The seed is breeder seed, it is a high cost. Seed availability is an issue. They deal with seed companies – not with the farmers. The gap is between the farmers and the seed companies. It is not MIST handling that, INVC should do that. Seed producer groups are linked to seed companies. They then have their own marketing channels. What is the volume of improved varieties?

Geographic Areas / Targeting

* targeting farmers with above 0.7 of a hectare (INVC). This is the majority.

Seed Fairs

* INVC has never done seed fairs, the seed fairs are not a continuation of INVC activities
* Commercial viability of “hand outs”

Activity 1

Sub-Activity 1.1

* INVC does the assessment (the secretariat). Happens before the planting season. Needs to be integrated using ACE knowledge of the market. Responsibility is with IITA. IITA will lead.

Sub-Activity 1.2

* INVC is there until the end, IITA is there. FUM / CADECOM and ACE to be there.

Sub-Activity 2.4

* FUM / CADECOM to work closely with IITA